



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,371	02/12/2001	Lisa A. Cornish	CRN01-UTL	9743

23442 7590 07/17/2002

KURT M RYLANDER
1014 FRANKLIN STREET
SUITE 206
VANCOUVER, WA 98660

[REDACTED]
EXAMINER

COMSTOCK, DAVID C

[REDACTED]
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3732

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/782,371	CORNISH, LISA A.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	David C. Comstock	3732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____ .
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____ .
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 5, 10, 11, 14, and 15 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claims 5, 10, and 14, "zigzag" should be --zig-zag--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 8, 12, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 8, 12, and 16 contain the trademark/trade name ZIP LOCK. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 USC § 112, second paragraph. *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/ a linear interference-fit closure and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Claims 1, 2, 3, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anderson (3,304,945).

Anderson discloses a hair treatment cap 11 comprising a plurality of long narrow slits 15 cut into the cap in two or more orientations. The cap is formed of plastic. The slits are 1/2 to 2/12 inches in length. The slits are reinforced by thicker plastic 33, 33' around the slits. (See Figs. 1 and 7; col. 2, lines 44-49; and col. 4, lines 39-42.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-6, 9, 10, 11, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (3,304,945).

Anderson discloses the claimed invention except for slits having a width in the range of 1/64" to 1/4". It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the slits with a width in the range of 1/64" to 1/4", since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. With regard to claims 5 and 10, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to form the slits in a zig-zag shape since applicant has not disclosed that the zig-zag shape solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well without the slits having a zig-zag shape. With regard to claims 6 and 9, it would have also been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to space the slits apart with a spacing in the range of 1/2" to 2", since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (3,304,945).

Anderson discloses a method of treating hair comprising placing a plastic cap having long, narrow slits therein over the hair of a person, pulling shanks of hair through the slits, treating the hair by frosting, and repeating until done. The slits are 1/2" to 2 1/2" in length. The slits are reinforced by thicker plastic 33, 33' around the slits. (See Figs. 1 and 7; col. 2, lines 60-64; and col. 4, lines 39-42

and 57-73.) Anderson does not disclose the slits having a width in the range of 1/64" to 1/4" or the slits being spaced apart with spacing in the range of 1/2" to 2". It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the slits with a width in the range of 1/64" to 1/4" and to space the slits apart with a spacing in the range of 1/2" to 2", since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. With regard to claim 14, it would have been further obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the slits with a zig-zag shape since applicant has not disclosed that the zig-zag shape solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well without the slits having a zig-zag shape.

Claims 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (3,304,945) in view of Sanzo (3,103,933).

Anderson discloses the claimed invention except for the slits having a ZIP LOCK closure. Sanzo discloses a similar device having a linear, interference-fit closure, 20, 21, i.e., ZIP LOCK, to provide a barrier to retain hair treatment fluid and facilitate the hair treatment process. (See Figs. 1 and 2; col. 1, lines 68-72; col. 2, lines 28-33; and col. 3, lines 33-37.) It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the hair treatment cap of Anderson with slits having a ZIP LOCK closure in view of

Sanzo in order to provide a barrier to retain hair treatment fluid and facilitate the hair treatment process.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (3,304,945) in view of Sanzo (3,103,933).

Anderson discloses the claimed device and method of claim 16 except for the slits having a ZIP LOCK closure. Sanzo discloses a similar device having a linear, interference-fit closure, 20, 21, i.e., ZIP LOCK, to provide a barrier to retain hair treatment fluid and facilitate the hair treatment process. (See Figs. 1 and 2; col. 1, lines 68-72; col. 2, lines 28-33; and col. 3, lines 33-37.) It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the hair treatment cap and method of Anderson with slits having a ZIP LOCK closure in view of Sanzo in order to provide a barrier to retain hair treatment fluid and facilitate the hair treatment process.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David C. Comstock whose telephone number is (703) 308-8514.


D.C. Comstock
July 15, 2002

Todd E. Manahan
Primary Examiner

